



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/520,498	01/06/2005	Sung-Joon Ahn	2080-3323 PCT	9780
35884 7590 02/01/2008 LEE, HONG, DEGERMAN, KANG & SCHMADEKA 660 S. FIGUEROA STREET Suite 2300 LOS ANGELES, CA 90017			EXAMINER KIM, TAE K	
			ART UNIT 2153	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 02/01/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/520,498

Applicant(s)

AHN ET AL.

Examiner

Tae K. Kim

Art Unit

2153

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 November 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7,9-17,19 and 21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7,9-17,19 and 21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 06 January 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### **DETAILED ACTION**

This is in response to the Applicant's response filed on November 5, 2007.

Claims 8, 18, and 20 have been cancelled by the Applicant. Claims 1 – 7, 9 – 17, 19, and 21, where Claims 1, 5, 17, and 19 are in independent form, are presented for examination.

#### ***Priority***

The Applicant has submitted a certified copy of the Korean application (10-2002-0040039) on November 9, 2007 as required by 35 U.S.C. 119(b).

#### ***Specification***

The Applicant has submitted a substitute specification to correct the informalities that were the basis of the objection. The objection to the specification is withdrawn.

#### ***Claim Objections***

With regards to the objection to Claim 2, the Applicant has amended the parent claim. The Examiner has withdrawn the objection to Claim 2.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

With regards to the rejections to Claims 8 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. 112, the Applicant has cancelled the claims. The Examiner has withdrawn the objection to Claims 8 and 18.

With regards to the rejections to Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 112, the Applicant has amended the claim. The Examiner has withdrawn the objection to Claim 1.

***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed on November 5, 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argued:

- a) Nagaoka does not disclose or suggest changing a service request from a remote access service unit into at least one UPnP (universal plug and play) message or changing a message from a UPnP device into a notification request and transmitting the UPnP message or the notification request to the remote access service unit as per amended Claim 1;
- b) Nagaoka does not disclose or suggest a list of devices preferred by the user, a list of requested events, services available from the provider, and user access priority for each device as per amended Claim 5;
- c) Nagaoka does not disclose or suggest a setup module for initializing the device control processing unit as per amended Claim 17;
- d) Nagaoka does not disclose or suggest the profile database of the remote access service unit as per amended Claim 17;
- e) Nagaoka does not disclose or suggest asynchronous notification functions comprising e-mail, voice telephone, and SMS (short message service) as per amended Claim 17;
- f) Nagaoka does not disclose or suggest the remote access server is included in the local home network or an internet provider server as per amended Claim 19.

With regards to b), Claim 5, as amended, necessitates a new search since the limitations stated (a list of devices preferred by the user, a list of requested events, services available from the provider, and user access priority for each device) were not required limitations, but merely possible limitations within the original claims. Nagaoka disclosed the screen size and type of the remote access terminal (Pg. 8, Para. 0152-0154, 0156; packet registration and registration process to initiate communication with the remote unit where the terminal ID of the remote unit is transmitted to the home network management facility, which determines the remote unit's capabilities and transmits the log-in screen based on those capabilities), which were one of the possible limitations within original Claim 8.

**Examiner respectfully disagrees with applicant's remaining assertions.**

1. With regards to a), Nagaoka discloses, expressly or implicitly, changing a service request from a remote access service unit into at least one UPnP (universal plug and play) message or changing a message from a UPnP device into a notification request and transmitting the UPnP message or the notification request to the remote access service unit (Para. 0091, 0093, 0095; home network management facility receives a control instruction from remote user terminal, then transmits the received control instruction to the home server via packet communication network; home server communicates with the home-located electronic devices via UPnP). The remote access device communicates through a website via HTTP (Para. 0015). The home network management

facility then relays information to the home server located on the home network to communicate a request or information (Abstract). UPnP can be the communication standard to communication within the home network, the devices connected to the home bus (Para. 0093). It is implicitly disclosed that the communication standard has changed from HTTP to the communication standard at home, which can be UPnP. Therefore, the system changes the remote service request to an UPnP message to pass within the home network to the appropriate device. Likewise, status or alert information from a home device is converted from UPnP to the communication standard that the remote device is communicating with the home network management facility.

2. With regards to c), Nagaoka discloses, expressly or implicitly, a setup module for initializing the device control processing unit (Pg. 8, Para. 0152-0154, 0156; packet registration and registration process to initiate communication with the remote unit where the terminal ID of the remote unit is transmitted to the home network management facility, which determines the remote unit's capabilities and transmits the log-in screen based on those capabilities).
3. With regards to d), Nagaoka discloses, expressly or implicitly, a profile database of the remote access service unit (Figs. 5 and 8; Para. 0133; the capabilities of the various remote access devices that have registered to access to the home network). The database associating the model name of each terminal with its display capability, communication capability, and communication standard establishes a remote access service unit profile database.

4. With regards to e), Nagaoka discloses, expressly or implicitly, asynchronous notification functions comprising of e-mail, voice telephone, and SMS (short message service). When an alarm is triggered, electronic mail is sent to the terminal of the use (Para. 0096). A telephone with internet capabilities would have the capabilities receiving notifications via email, voice, and SMS. Furthermore, the remote access device can be a notebook PC (Para. 085) and the network management facility formats the data accordingly to the capabilities of the remote control device. Email and SMS are both electronic messaging systems that are applicable in of displaying the type of electronic message described in Nagaoka (See Fig. 20A). Nagaoka also discloses the capability of performing remote control operations via voice guidance (Para. 0016).
5. With regards to f), Nagaoka discloses, expressly or implicitly, that suggest the remote access server is included in the local home network or an internet provider server (Figs. 1 and 2; Para 0099-0103; the home network control server is connected to the home communication bus). The home network control server communicates with and performs the various control instructions from the home network management facility. Nagaoka uses both external and local home servers to provide remote access to the home devices. The URL corresponding to each resource is configured on the home server so the HTTP server transmits to the user the corresponding data configured and stored on the home server (Para. 0114). Therefore, remote access to the home network is accomplished in conjunction with the home server (Para. 0007).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

**Claims 1, 2, 17, 19, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Appl. 2002/0180579 A1, filed by Tatsuji Nagaoka et al. (hereinafter "Nagaoka").**

6. Regarding Claims 1 and 2, Nagaoka discloses a remote control system of a home network (Fig. 1; Abstract), comprising of a device control processing unit (Figs. 1 and 2; Pgs. 5-6, Para. 0099, 0100, 0103; home server comprises of a control unit which communicates with the home network management facility and the home-located devices) for including a home network view a list of a plurality of controlled devices (Fig. 3; Pg. 6, Para. 0108; display shows each home-located device or security system), state of each device (Fig. 3; Pg. 6, Para. 0108; status information shows the latest status of the home-located devices), a list of subscribed events (Fig. 3; Pg. 6, Para. 0110; display of home-based devices shows the programming history of the recording



requests made on particular devices that have such a feature, in this instance a VCR), a list of service requests (Fig. 3; Pg. 6, Para. 0110; display of home-based devices shows the programming requests made on particular devices that have the ability to preprogram certain functions, in this instance a VCR). Nagaoka further discloses of processing a possible service request, changing a service request from a remote access service unit into at least one UPnP (universal plug and play) message or changing a message from a UPnP device into a notification and transmitting it the UPnP message or the notification request to the remote access service unit (Pg. 5, Para. 0091, 0093, 0095; home network management facility receives a control instruction from remote user terminal, then transmits the received control instruction to the home server via packet communication network; home server communicates with the home-located electronic devices via UPnP). *See also rebuttal to Argument a) above.*

7. Regarding Claim 17, Nagaoka discloses a remote control system of a home network (Fig. 1; Abstract), comprising of a device control processing unit operating as a CP (control point) (Figs. 1 and 2; Pgs. 5-6, Para. 0099, 0100, 0103; home server comprises of a control unit which communicates with the home network management facility and the home-located devices) for mutual operation with a plurality of devices and controlling the plurality of devices according to a service request from a remote terminal (Pg. 5, Para. 0091, 0093, 0095; home network management facility receives a control instruction from remote user terminal, then transmits the received control instruction to the home server via packet communication network; home server communicates with the home-located electronic devices via UPnP), a remote access

service unit for notifying the device control processing unit of the service request from the remote terminal (Fig. 1; home network management facility manages communications between the home network and the remote access device), a remote terminal service unit for transmitting the service request to the remote access service unit and transmitting a response from the remote access service unit to a pertinent terminal (Fig. 1), a setup module for initializing the device control processing unit (Pg. 8, Para. 0152-0154, 0156; packet registration and registration process to initiate communication with the remote unit where the terminal ID of the remote unit is transmitted to the home network management facility, which determines the remote unit's capabilities and transmits the log-in screen based on those capabilities) and a profile database of the remote access service unit (Pg. 8, Para. 0152-0154, 0156; packet registration and registration process to initiate communication with the remote unit where the terminal ID of the remote unit is transmitted to the home network management facility, which determines the remote unit's capabilities and transmits the log-in screen based on those capabilities), and a communication module for providing asynchronous notification functions comprising e-mail, voice telephone, and SMS (short message service) (Fig. 20A; Para. 0016, 0096; electronic messages that can be both displayed via e-mail and SMS and the ability to use voice). *See also rebuttals to Arguments c), d), and e) above.*

8. Regarding Claim 19, Nagaoka discloses a remote control system of a home network (Fig. 1; Abstract), comprising of a local home network in which plural devices are connected (Fig. 1), a remote terminal for controlling the local home network from a

remote place (Pg. 5, Para. 0091, 0093, 0095; home network management facility receives a control instruction from remote user terminal, then transmits the received control instruction to the home server via packet communication network; home server communicates with the home-located electronic devices via UPnP), and a remote access server which functions as a local CP (control point) and transmits a request to the remote control, or receives an answer from the remote terminal (Figs. 1 and 2; Pgs. 5-6, Para. 0099, 0100, 0103; home server comprises of a control unit which communicates with the home network management facility and the home-located devices), wherein the remote access server is included in the local home network or an internet provider server (Figs. 1 and 2; Para 0099-0103; the home network control server is connected to the home communication bus). *See also rebuttal to Argument f) above.*

9. Regarding Claim 21, Nagaoka discloses all the limitations of Claim 19 above. Nagaoka further discloses that the remote access server acquires state information of a plurality of devices connected to the local home network with reference to a device list to be controlled (Fig. 3; Pg. 6, Para. 0108; display shows each home-located device or security system), a list of subscribed events and a service request list (Fig. 3; Pg. 6, Para. 0110; display of home-based devices shows the programming requests made on particular devices that have the ability to preprogram certain functions, in this instance a VCR), and controls the plurality of devices by processing request/response with the remote terminal (Pg. 5, Para. 0091, 0093, 0095; home network management facility receives a control instruction from remote user terminal, then transmits the received

control instruction to the home server via packet communication network; home server communicates with the home-located electronic devices via UPnP).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

**Claims 3 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nagaoka.**

10. Regarding Claim 3, Nagaoka discloses all the limitations of Claim 1 above.

Nagaoka, further discloses that the device control processing unit has a database for each remote terminal that has access to the home network (Pg. 5, Para. 0085, 0086; Pg. 7, Para. 0133; terminal information database holds information regarding the remote unit's communication capabilities). However, Nagaoka does not specifically disclose that the device control processing unit includes one local CP for each remote terminal.

It was well known to one skilled in the art at the time the invention that each remote terminal can be associated with a unique control point accessing the various devices within the home network. It would have been obvious that the user and terminal information, security level, and preferences that are stored within the system can be used to allow a specific configuration that can limit the types of devices that the user has access to. These configurations can either be done logically within one CP or physically with one CP associated with each remote terminal within the system. These

individually associated CP's will prevent the access of more harmful devices by specific users; for example, children will not have access to the home security system or the kitchen appliances.

11. Regarding Claim 4, Nagaoka discloses all the limitations of Claim 1 above.

Nagaoka further discloses that the device control processing unit has a database for each remote terminal that has access to the home network (Pg. 5, Para. 0085, 0086; Pg. 7, Para. 0133; terminal information database holds information regarding the remote unit's communication capabilities). However, Nagaoka does not specifically disclose that the device control processing unit includes one local CP for each device kind.

It was well known to one skilled in the art at the time the application was filed that each device kind can be associated with a unique CP within the home network. The Nagaoka system has a database that stores access information associated with each user. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to also create a database storing information associated with each device that is connected to the home network. Furthermore, these devices can be grouped logically within the database or physically by having one local CP connected to one particular device type. For example, a CP will need different drivers and communication ports to control televisions versus a refrigerator. Having a different CP controlling those devices will allow the user to access or perform more specified functions available for each device type since the associated CP can be customized to the functions available within those devices less the specifications that are not needed to control the other devices.

**Claims 5 – 7 and 9 – 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C, 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nagaoka, in view of U.S. Patent 5,758,057, invented by Hiroshi Baba et al. (hereinafter “Baba”).**

12. Regarding Claim 5, Nagaoka discloses a remote control system of a home network (Fig. 1; Abstract), comprising of a remote access service unit for receiving a user's web request from a remote terminal service unit (Figs. 1 and 2; Pgs. 5-6, Para. 0099, 0100, 0103; home server comprises of a control unit which communicates with the home network management facility and the home-located devices), transmitting the web request to a device control processing unit by converting the web request into a service request according to contents of the web request (Pg. 5, Para. 0091, 0093, 0095; home network management facility receives a control instruction from remote user terminal, then transmits the received control instruction to the home server via packet communication network; home server communicates with the home-located electronic devices via UPnP), and transmitting a web response for a pertinent remote terminal to the remote terminal service unit by having a service view comprising at least one web document (Para. 0086; remote terminal communicates control instructions to the remote terminal service unit via a web browser), wherein the remote access service unit includes a profile database (Para. 0186, 0195; once the instructions are complete, the network management server receives the control complete information and transfers that info to the HTTP server; then web data is sent to the user terminal displaying that the request was completed and the status of the home-located device after completion of the request) comprising of performance of the remote access terminal including a

screen size and a type of an input device (Fig. 8; remote access terminal performance information correlates to terminal ID is user profile) and network provider's network bandwidth and services available from the provider (Para. 0012-0016, 0085; communication capacity of a remote terminal is determined by the maximum amount of data in a single reception; the types of services depend on the type of network, continuously or intermittently connected). Nagaoka does not disclose that the profile database comprising of a list of devices preferred by the user, a list of requested events, and user access priority for each device.

Baba discloses the use of establishing priority levels for multiple users that determine priority of access to each device in a system with multiple devices (Fig. 1; Col. 8, Lines 31-42). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to establish user priority for accessing system devices where multiple users have access to allow higher priority users to access a particular device ahead of lower priority users when that device is accessed simultaneously by multiple users (Col. 8, Lines 31-42). Access priority to each device can be associated with the security level for each user already incorporated in Nagaoka. Doing so will essentially eliminate waiting periods for higher priority users to access particular devices when there is high user traffic within the home network.

It was well known to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to expand the user profile database to include a list of devices preferred by the user. It would have been obvious that the list of devices preferred by the user can be readily incorporated within the user profile database in Nagaoka since a user might not want to display all

the devices connected to the home network which can be accessed by a particular user (See Para. 0126 of Nagaoka). The terminal being used may also limit the visibility of the control screen based on the remote terminal capabilities and the visual display would be easier to access if fewer devices were displayed. This would allow a user to personally modify the device control screen to display the most accessed or preferred home devices.

It was also well known to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to expand the user profile database to include a list of requested events. It would have been obvious to store a list of requested events for each user to accurately record the transactions of each user within the system. Doing so would allow the system provider to accurately bill each user for using the system. Furthermore, it would allow the system provider to determine the usage habits of each user.

13. Regarding Claim 6, Nagaoka, in view of Baba, discloses all the limitations of Claim 5 above. Nagaoka further discloses that the service view comprises at least one web document connected to each other, and the web document includes a home network device state and control page, a device list page, and a user option page (Figs. 14.A-14N, 15A-15L; Pgs. 10-11, Para. 0177-0195; web pages are displayed based on user input, including a list of devices controlled, the state of the devices, and user option feature to change the status of or control the devices).

14. Regarding Claim 7, Nagaoka, in view of Baba, discloses all the limitations of Claim 5 above. Nagaoka further discloses that the remote access service unit determines the service view of a remote access service according to service-related



information recorded in the profile database (Pg. 7, Para. 0120-127; security levels associated with each user determines the types of devices the user has access to), and provides various remote access services to the user and the remote terminal referring to the service view (Fig. 6; Pgs. 6-7, Para. 0118-0128; security level of each user determines the type of devices they have remote access to and the services available to the user will be affected and shown on the user terminal).

15. Regarding Claims 9 and 10, Nagaoka, in view of Baba, discloses all the limitations of Claim 5 above. Baba further discloses that the remote access service unit includes a mechanism for solving home network collision, in case multiple remote terminals simultaneously access the remote access service unit, to solve the home network collision at a home network level, a device level, an operation level, or a mixed level comprising the device level and the operation level (Fig. 1; Col. 8, Lines 31-42; See rejection to Claim 5 above).

16. Regarding Claim 11, Nagaoka, in view of Baba, discloses all the limitations of Claim 9 above. Nagaoka further discloses that the remote access service unit includes a profile database (Fig. 6; Pgs. 6-7, Para. 0118; customer management database), determines a service view of a remote access service according to service related information recorded in a profile database (Pg. 7, Para. 0120-127; security levels associated with each user determines the types of devices the user has access to), and provides various remote access services to a user and a remote terminal with reference to the service view (Fig. 6; Pgs. 6-7, Para. 0118-0128;

security level of each user determines the type of devices they have remote access to and the services available to the user will be affected and shown on the user terminal).

It would have been known to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to have a device access database which included a device access priority table to store the method disclosed in Baba. It would have been obvious to extend the user profile database in Nagaoka to include a device access database that already contained access levels per user which are associated with the types of devices a user had access to. This would to accurately record the transactions of each user within the system and the devices that are being used. Doing so would allow the system provider to accurately bill each user for using the system. Furthermore, it would allow the system provider to determine the usage habits of each user.

17. Regarding Claim 12, Nagaoka, in view of Baba, discloses all the limitations of Claim 11 above. Baba further discloses that a user's access priority is recorded for all devices in the home network, wherein a first user with a higher priority rank has priority over a second user with a lower priority rank when the first user and the second user collide at a device recorded in the table (Fig. 1; Col. 8, Lines 31-42; See rejection to Claim 5 above).

18. Regarding Claim 13, Nagaoka, in view of Baba, discloses all the limitations of Claim 11 above. Nagaoka or Baba do not further disclose of a device access database includes a share type table indicating accessibility to a device by other users while a specific operation of the device is being performed by the user.

It would have been well known to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention that the device access database can include a sharing type table by device's operations indicating access possibility from other users in performing a specific operation supported by the device. When a user requests to record something on a VCR, that operation would not be available if the recording time slot is already filled. Furthermore, while the VCR is recording, a user can access the device and request to record during an available timeslot without interfering with the current recording function. It would have been obvious that the home network management facility in Nagaoka can be further used to allow the various device operations to be available or busy depending on that operation to allow that operation to be performed in a device as long as it doesn't interfere with the current operations of the device. This allows the devices to process more than one service request at a given time that do not cause harm to that device, the home, or other devices when performed together.

19. Regarding Claims 14 and 15, Nagaoka, in view of Baba, discloses all the limitations of Claim 11 above. Nagaoka or Baba do not further disclose that the device access database includes an access authority table, which lists access authority by priority ranks and user ranks for operations supported by each device.

It would have been well know to one skilled in the art at the time the application was filed that the device access database records an access authority table by priorities or users regarding operations supported by each device. The user access priority system disclosed by Baba allows service requests made into the home network to perform the highest priority user first if there is an access collision. Each user terminal

is also associated with a security level per Nagaoka and the user information is stored within the user profile database. Since the priorities will determine which device will perform service request first and certain service requests are more important than others, it would be obvious to record the device access authority table by priorities. Additionally, each user has a specific security level associated with it that determines the types of devices the user has access to making it obvious to record the device access authority table by users. Recording the device access authority table by either users or priorities provides a means of verifying that only certain users have accessed particular devices or services within the home network and made the various setting changes or service requests for each device.

20. Regarding Claim 16, Nagaoka, in view of Baba, discloses all the limitations of Claim 11 above. Nagaoka further discloses that the remote terminal service unit is included for performing mutual communication as web request/response with the remote terminal via a built-in web server (Figs. 14.A-14N, 15A-15L; Pgs. 10-11, Para. 0177-0195; web pages are displayed based on user input, including a list of devices controlled, the state of the devices, and user option feature to change the status of or control the devices), transmitting the web request from the user to a remote access service unit, and transmitting the web response from the remote access service unit to the remote terminal (Pg. 5, Para. 0091, 0093, 0095; home network management facility receives a control instruction from remote user terminal, then transmits the received control instruction to the home server via packet communication network; home server communicates with the home-located electronic devices via UPnP), wherein the web

response comprises a web document form generated referring to the recent service view (Fig. 6; Pgs. 6-7, Para. 0118-0128; security level of each user determines the type of devices they have remote access to and the services available to the user will be affected and shown on the user terminal).

### ***Conclusion***

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

### ***Contacts***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tae K. Kim, whose telephone number is (571) 270-1979. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday (8:00 AM - 5:00 PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenton B. Burgess, can be reached on (571) 272-3949. The fax phone number for submitting all Official communications is (703) 872-9306. The fax phone number for submitting informal communications such as drafts, proposed amendments, etc., may be faxed directly to the examiner at (571) 270-2979.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at (866) 217-9197 (toll-free).

TKK

January 22, 2008

  
THU HA NGUYEN  
PRIMARY EXAMINER